



Chandra, Y., Scarpa, F., Adhikari, S., Zhang, J., Saavedra Flores, E. I., & Peng, H. (2016). Pullout strength of graphene and carbon nanotube/epoxy composites. *Composites Part B: Engineering*, 102, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compositesb.2016.06.070>

Peer reviewed version

License (if available):
CC BY-NC-ND

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1016/j.compositesb.2016.06.070](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compositesb.2016.06.070)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Elsevier at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compositesb.2016.06.070>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

Pullout strength of graphene and carbon nanotube/epoxy composites

Y Chandra^a, F Scarpa^b, S Adhikari^{a,*}, J Zhang^c, E. I. Saavedra Flores^d, Hua-Xin Peng^e

^a*Zienkiewicz Centre for Computational Engineering, Swansea University, Swansea SA1 8EN, UK*

^b*Advanced Composites Centre for Innovation and Science, University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 1TR, UK*

^c*Department of Material Science and Engineering, National University of Defense Technology, Changsha, Hunan 410073, PR China*

^d*Departamento de Ingeniería en Obras Civiles, Universidad de Santiago de Chile, Av. Ecuador 3659, Santiago, Chile*

^e*College of Materials Science and Engineering, Zhejiang University, Hanzhou, 310027, PR China*

Abstract

An atomistic multiscale modelling approach is used to simulate the nonlinear pullout behaviour of interlinked single walled carbon nano tubes (SWCNT) and single layer graphene sheets (SLGS) embedded in an epoxy polymer. The pullout forces have been computed for various configurations of nanocomposites (SWCNT-SWCNT, SLGS-SLGS and hybrid SLGS-SWCNT), also by evaluating the effect provided by three different interlink compounds. The interfacial strength due to fibre pullout predicted by the hybrid atomistic-FE model is compared against experimental and molecular dynamics results available in open literature. The results show the specific deformation characteristics (localised auxetics) that provide an increase of pullout forces and interfacial strength with the use of the links.

Keywords: Graphene sheets; carbon nanotubes; hybrid nanocomposites; atomistic FE; pullout; shear strength; auxetics;

1. Introduction

Carbon based nanomaterials such as graphene sheets and CNTs display exceptional mechanical [9, 12, 24, 47, 50, 52, 54, 55, 58, 64, 71, 72] and electrical [15, 31, 32, 34, 40, 69, 74, 77] properties. These nanostructures can be used to reinforce polymers and in general multifunctional composites and devices [2, 17, 18, 36]. Graphene sheets can be mechanically exfoliated from graphite, chemically modified and then be embedded in polymer solution [62], or dispersed in an organic solution and then used as stable fillers in polymers [68]. CNT reinforced polymer

*Corresponding author. Tel: +44 (0)1792 602088, Fax: + 44 (0)1792 295676
Email address: S.Adhikari@swansea.ac.uk (S Adhikari)

composites can be produced by casting in a polymer [11], or typically by dispersing CNTs in a solvent by sonication followed by mix in a polymer liquid with ensuing evaporation of the initial solvent [51]. The demand for nanocomposites in industrial applications is ramping up [27], however some drawbacks are still present in the modern production of carbon-based structural materials. More specifically, some of the main problems are represented by an inadequate bonding between the matrix and reinforcement, the difficulty of producing an uniform dispersion within the matrix, and in general the generation of homogeneous dispersions in large-scale composite structures. However, the molecular bridging between nano structures within the polymer can enhance the structural performance of the composite [75] and overcome the drawback represented by the inadequate bonding strength.





Fig. 1: Multiscale model of hybrid nano-composite with interlinkers: Three different types of inter-linkers have been simulated (refer Fig. 2)


To reduce the capital costs involved in the manufacturing of nanocomposites with additional chemical and functionalization groups it is essential to evaluate the aspects of fibre bridging at simulation level. The computational modelling of the mechanical properties of graphene sheets and CNTs at atomic scale has been performed by several researchers using Finite Element

techniques [9, 45, 46, 50, 55, 57, 58, 64]. The Finite Element-based atomistic simulation techniques to represent general carbon nanostructures have been used for example by Scarpa et al [9, 52, 54, 55] and Pour et al [49, 50]. Scarpa and co-authors in particular have developed a multiscale hybrid atomistic FE technique to represent the interaction existing between C-C sp^2 and sp^3 bonds, van der Waals interactions [9, 35, 54], the influence of hydrogenated bonds [56], and recently extended the technique to simulate the mechanics of DNA strands [1]. Atomistic-FE methods have also been used to describe the nonlinear and fracture properties of graphene and carbon nanotubes [6, 7], as well as the mechanical behaviour of nanocomposites and graphene reinforcements [10, 58–60]. Nanocomposites based on SLGS/SWCNT reinforcement can be considered as two-phase or multiphase materials, represented at their most basic configuration by the presence of a nanoinclusion and a surrounding matrix. At meso and nanoscales the polymer matrix can be considered as a continuous structure. Using the hybrid atomistic-FE approach the SLGS/SWCNT nanoinclusions can be represented numerically by an array of hexagonally oriented beam elements (Bernoulli [65] or Timoshenko [55]), with their nodes being the carbon atoms. The polymer matrix at micro scale can be approximated by 3D solid tetrahedral elements. The molecules of the polymer matrix are connected to carbon atoms through van der Waals forces represented by Lennard-Jones (LJ) potentials, when no functional groups are present. From the numerical standpoint, the LJ potential attractive and repulsive forces between the fibre and the matrix can be transferred through nonlinear spring elements [30, 58].


This work aims at investigating the effects due to the presence of molecular inter-linkers between different combinations of nano fillers (SWCNT/SWCNT, SLGS/SLGS and SWCNT/SLGS - 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c) respectively) on the overall pullout force and strength of the composite material. The hybridization of the fillers has been done, since such composites are multiphase in nature. Exploitation of such multiphase composite systems has become a major topic of interest in recent years [3, 23, 25]. The use of aliphatic diamines and aromatic phenylenediamine as connecting functional groups between single wall carbon nanotubes within a polyethylene matrix has been observed to produce a significant increase of the pullout tensile force and the energy dissipated at the interface between the matrix and the carbon nanotubes [76]. The present work explores further the concept by using a modified multiscale approach based on the atomistic - FE approach to produce Representative Volume Elements (RVEs) that describe the polymer matrix, nanomaterial reinforcements, chemical group interlinks and van der Waals interactions within a nonlinear materials, geometry and failure criteria modelling framework. In this work we



(a) Aliphatic diamine $(CH_2)_3N_2H_4$ (Inter-linker-1)



(b) Aliphatic diamine $(CH_2)_{10}N_2H_4$ (Inter-linker-2)



(c) Aromatic Phenylenediamine (PDA)

Fig. 2: Inter-linkers used to bridge fillers in nano-composite RVEs.

will consider three different types of inter-linkers (Fig. 2): aliphatic diamines $(CH_2)_3N_2H_4$, long chain aliphatic diamines $(CH_2)_{10}N_2H_4$ and Phenylenediamine (referred to as PDA). In Fig. 2 the black atoms are referred to carbon, the blue atoms represent nitrogen, the white atoms are indicative of hydrogen, while the red atoms are representative of the connections between the polymer and the fillers. To the best of the Authors' knowledge, the work presented in this paper

features two levels of novelty. The first is related to the multiscale model, that incorporates the simulation of chemical groups interconnecting matrix and the carbon nanostructures within an atomistic - FE method. The results of the proposed model are benchmarked against analogous data from open literature produced using other molecular mechanics models. The second novelty lies within the prediction of the tensile pullout and shear strength of graphene/graphene and hybrid graphene/carbon nanotube reinforcements, and the assessment of the mechanical performance against interlinked SWCNT configurations already evaluated by other researchers. To the best of the Authors' knowledge these aspects have not been described in open literature so far.

2. Multiscale model of the nanocomposite structures

The sp^2 covalent bonds of the SWCNT and SLGS structures are represented here using deep shear Timoshenko with six degrees of freedom (3 translational and 3 rotational) beams [9, 55]. The element type B31 from the ABAQUS element library has been used to simulate covalent bonds. The length of each beam is 0.142 nm (the equilibrium length of C-C sp^2) and the diameter (thickness) is 0.089 nm [55]. The equivalent mechanical properties of the beams representing the C-C bonds are calculated based on the energy equivalence between the beams' strain energy and the stoichiometric harmonic potential calculated through force constant methods [55]:

$$\frac{k_r}{2} (\delta r)^2 = \frac{EA}{2L} (\delta r)^2 \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{k_\tau}{2} (\delta \varphi)^2 = \frac{GJ}{2L} (\delta \varphi)^2 \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{k_\theta}{2} (\delta \theta)^2 = \frac{EI}{2L} \frac{4+\Phi}{1+\Phi} (\delta \theta)^2 \quad (3)$$

In the above equations, k_r represents the stretching force constant and k_τ the out-of-plane torsional constant. The term k_θ represents a combined in-plane rotation (bending and torsion), consistent with the harmonic potential approach [55]. The term Φ is the shear correction factor, which becomes significant if the aspect ratio of beams is lower than 10 [63]. The numerical values of the constants mentioned in the above equations can be obtained by using the linearised Morse potential model [55] ($k_r = 84.7nN\text{\AA}^{-1}$, $k_\theta = 9.00nN\text{\AA}rad^{-2}$ and $k_\tau = 2.78nN\text{\AA}rad^{-2}$). For comprehensive understanding of this methodology, the readers are referred to [52, 53, 55]. The values of the equivalent material and the element property information for C-C bonds in SLGS and SWCNT are provided in Table 2. In the present work the mechanical nonlinearity of the

Table 1: Element properties for the beam elements used to represent CC bonds. d stands for the diameter, l is the length, A is the cross sectional area, E represents the Young’s modulus, ν is Poisson’s ratio and ϕ is the shear correction factor [55].

Property	Value
d	0.089 nm
l	0.142 nm
A	1.01 nm ²
E	19.5 TPa
ν	0.23
ϕ	0.37

Table 2: Thicknesses, lengths and Young’s moduli for bonds in inter-linkers [1].

Bond types	Bond length (\AA)	Bond thickness (\AA)	Young’s Modulus [TPa]
CH	1.08	1.01	6
CN	1.39	0.79	23.5
HN	1.01	0.8	16

covalent bonds deformation has been ignored. The equivalent stress-strain curve for sp^2 C-C covalent bonds and graphene/carbon nanotubes can be found in various works [6, 7, 20, 38, 65]. The single C-C bond shows a linear regime under tensile loading up to 10 % [6]. Armchair and zigzag graphene sheets in graphitic state show a substantial linearity of the tensile response also up to 10 % in Molecular Dynamics models using AIREBO potential [41]. In a nano-composite with low loading (less than 0.5 % wt fraction in the present work), one can also expect larger strain levels occurring in the polymer but not in the graphene sheet. Since the maximum tensile deformation in the present simulations corresponds to around 10 % strain, the assumption of linear elastic regime with nonlinear geometric deformation for both SWCNT and SLGS can be considered justified. Similarly to the approach used for the C-C bonds, the mechanical properties of the other bonds in the inter-linkers can also be obtained applying the same energy equivalence, this time using the Universal Force Field (UFF) model [1, 43]. These equivalent mechanical properties are presented in Table 2. In order to simulate the tensile strength of interlinkers, a cutoff strain of about 20 % has been assumed. If the bonds in the interlinkers are strained beyond this value, then the stiffness of the bonds will be reduced to zero. The 20 % has been taken from the C-C bond inflection point of the curve present in Baykasoglu and Mugan [7]. However, during the simulation, the bonds in the interlinker do not get strained beyond 10 %, due to contact with the polymer.

The graphene sheets are connected to the polymer matrix by van der Waals forces described by nonlinear springs providing attractive and repulsive forces and following the force-

displacement model [9, 54]:

$$F_{ij} = \frac{\partial V_{ij}}{\partial r} \quad (4)$$

Where r is the atomic displacement along the \mathbf{ij} connected carbon nanostructure/matrix atoms.

The force between the atoms (ij) can also be represented by [21]:

$$F_{ij} = -12 \epsilon \left[\left(\frac{r_{min}}{y} \right)^{13} - \left(\frac{r_{min}}{y} \right)^7 \right] \quad (5)$$

Where $y = r_{min} + \delta r$, δr is the atomic displacement along the length \mathbf{ij} . The r_{min} (in Å) is given by $2^{\frac{1}{6}} \sigma$, where $\sigma = (A/B)^{1/6}$. The terms B and A represent attractive and repulsive constants. For the carbon-polymer interaction we adopt the values given in [5, 21, 58], ($A = 3.4 \times 10^{-4} \text{ eV} \times \text{\AA}^{12}$ and $B = 5 \times 10^{-7} \text{ eV} \times \text{\AA}^6$). The term ϵ is equal to $B^2/(4A)$. In the multiscale models we use nonlinear spring elements to simulate the interaction between reinforcement, with an equivalent force deflection curve calculated using Eq. 5. The type of element used in the ABAQUS solver is SPRINGA.




Fig. 3: Boundary conditions on four different multiscale FE models containing two fillers.

The polymer matrix has been discretized using 3D continuum elements with six degrees of freedom (C3D4 in ABAQUS). Isotropic material properties have been assumed to represent the material behavior of an epoxy matrix (Young's modulus OF 2.0 GPa and Poisson's ratio of 0.3 [70]). The nonlinearity in the mechanical behaviour of the polymer matrix has been considered by using a Ramberg Osgood approximation [70]. Relevant points of the epoxy stress-strain curve

are shown in Table 3. A damage criterion based on strain (5 %) [10] has been assigned to ensure that the stiffness of the elements strained beyond that tensile threshold in the polymer becomes zero.

Table 3: Points of the stress-strain curve for epoxy matrix based on Ramberg Osgood approximation [70].

Stress in MPa	Strain in %
15	1.0
40	2.0
60	3.0
62	4.0

The dimensions of the RVEs are $60\text{\AA} \times 40\text{\AA} \times 110\text{\AA}$. The SWCNTs used in this work are of armchair type (40,40) with a length of 98\AA . The SLGSs used consist also of an armchair type (40,40), again with a length of 98\AA . These dimensions ensure that both fillers have same surface area. As the SLGS offers a 2D surface, the contact interface with the polymer molecules occurs at both surfaces (top and bottom of the SLGS sheets). The force required to pull a fibre has been calculated by constraining one end of the nano-composite structure and applying a displacement to the end of filler in opposite side, similarly to the boundary conditions applied in [10, 76]. One end of the RVE is constrained and a displacement is applied at the tab end of one of the nano-reinforcements (Fig. 3). The forces from one nanofiller are transferred to the other through the action of the inter-linker. The SWCNT-SWCNT nanocomposite contains two SWCNTs as reinforcements, with one of them being the primary filler (the one to which the end deformation is applied). A similar topology is applied to the SLGS-SLGS model. The SLGS-SWCNT model has the single layer graphene sheet at the reinforcement subjected to the external displacement. The pullout force is calculated as the reaction force measured at the end of the entire RVE where the displacement has been applied to the primary reinforcement. A node-to-element contact definition has been assigned between the nodes of the filler, inter-linkers and the surface of 3D elements in the polymer matrix. A nonlinear Newton-Raphson solver with switch on large deformation effects has been used to simulate the fibre pullout [16]. The simulation is executed until the reinforcement comes out of the matrix at a distance of 14.5\AA . Beyond this cut-off length the elements of the reinforcement and the spring elements representing the LJ potential have been found to be unstable. During the simulation it was essential to deactivate the interface bonds between the filler and matrix if the deflection developed is higher than the cut-off distance of 0.85 nm [58]. It was also necessary to generate new bonds if a displaced carbon atom comes in contact with another atom of the matrix. Within the FE code ABAQUSTM version 6.10,

this operation is performed by using the commands *Restart and *Modelchange [16]. The nodal displacements in the spring elements (interface bonds) are recorded at each increment step of the nonlinear loading. If the nodal displacement is found to be beyond the cut-off distance the analysis is stopped and restarted with an updated position of the nodes belonging to the spring elements. Another *Restart command is then issued to restart the run from the same increment. Activation and de-activation of the spring element sets are performed using the commands *Modelchange,Remove and *Modelchange,Add. This process has been referred to as the "debonding" and "rebonding" mechanism in the current work. Possible interlocking phenomenon due to the interaction between the carbon nanoreinforcements and matrix are taken into by defining a contact interaction (node to surface) between the fillers and polymer. Similar multiscale models have been developed by Li and Chou [30] and been used by Shokrieh and Rafiee [60]. However, these models do not describe the presence of interlinks between the nanoinclusion and the matrix as discrete functional groups.

3. Results and discussions

The pullout forces versus the tensile deformation are shown for various types of nano-reinforcement and inter-linkers in figures 4 and 5. The general trend of these forces is very similar for all the four boundary conditions considered, and this indicates that the two types of nano-reinforcement are quite close in terms of mechanical behaviour under the conditions assumed in this work. It is however possible to observe some differences in terms of magnitudes of the pullout forces when the reinforcements are directly compared one against the other. The maximum pullout force observed for a composite with a SLGS being the primary reinforcement is 370 nN, 6% higher compared to the case in which the single wall carbon nanotube is the primary filler (refer to Figure 4(a)). The higher interfacial strength in the SLGS nanocomposite due to the higher contact surface area between the reinforcement and the polymer is believed to be responsible for this behaviour. The same trend has been also observed in the other two nanocomposite topologies (Figures 5(a) and (b)) because the primary reinforcements in the SWCNT/SLGS and SLGS/SWCNT configurations are the same as the ones in the SLGS/SLGS and SWCNT/SWCNT nanocomposites respectively (Figure 3). The force/displacements curves remain almost identical up to a pullout distance of 0.2 nm, because only the primary reinforcement is bearing the load at this stage. After this threshold distance a sudden increase in load (first peak) can be observed due to the debonding and rebonding of the van der Waals interactions in the primary reinforcement. Beyond the 0.2 nm pullout distance the curves however diverge

because the load starts to be shared by the inter-linker groups. The composites without inter-linkers generate lower reaction forces beyond this distance. In the case of the nanocomposites with the inter-linkers a sudden increase in load can be observed, with its magnitude depending upon the type of inter-linker used. The model with the $(CH_2)_{10}N_2H_4$ groups generates the highest load at this point, because of its higher length that allows to transfer the load at higher tensile displacements. The PDA inter-linker also offers an increase in terms of load to pullout, since it possess a larger surface that facilitates the contact with the surrounding polymer. After the threshold distance the load will be distributed uniformly in the two reinforcements. As the load is transferred to the couple of reinforcements through the inter-linkers the walls of the carbon nanostructures distort, leading to interlocking of these walls with the surrounding polymer. Such wall distortion in the case of the SWCNT fillers can be considered a localised auxetic effect [76] (Fig. 6), similarly to what observed in auxetic polymeric fibres subjected to pullout tests [61]. As also demonstrated by MD simulations carried previously by some of the Authors [76], the auxetic effect enhances the pullout resistance of the nano reinforcements because of the fretting of the nanofiller against the matrix system due to the transverse tensile expansion (negative Poisson's ratio effect), leading to increased toughness and energy dissipation of the overall structure [8]. Further discontinuities in the load/displacement curves can be observed around 0.75 nm as a result of the debonding/rebonding occurring within the secondary reinforcement. The reaction force generated by the secondary filler in the SWCNT-SWCNT nanocomposite is around 160 nN, 12.5% lower than in the case of the SLGS/SLGS configuration, and a further indication that the single layer graphene offers an enhanced uniaxial tensile mechanical performance, also a secondary reinforcements. Similar trends can also be noticed in the hybrid SWCNT/SLGS and SLGS/SWCNT nanocomposites.

The interfacial strength between the filler and the matrix can be calculated as [76]:

$$E_{pullout} = 2\pi r L \tau_i d - \pi r \tau_i d^2 \quad (6)$$

In the above equation, τ_i is the interfacial shear strength, r and L are the width and length of the reinforcements, x is the axial location in which the strength of the nanocomposite is measured and d is the deformation of the nanoreinforcement. The pullout energy in kcal/mol can be calculated by $F_{pullout} = \frac{\partial E_{pullout}}{\partial d}$, in which $F_{pullout}$ is the lowest pullout force (in nN) measured during the simulation and d is deformation expressed in nm. The interfacial strength τ_i measured in the current work and compared with the one determined by other authors is given




Fig. 4: Force required to pull out the fibre from the SLGS-SLGS and SWCNT-SWCNT nanocomposites.




Fig. 5: Force required to pull out the fibre from the hybrid nanocomposites.

in Table 4. The magnitude of the interfacial strength computed in the present work is within the lower end of the reported values in open literature (44 MPa - 102 MPa). There is a noticeable scatter in the values of the interfacial shear strength, the variability attributed to the different types of force models adopted in the molecular dynamics simulations, the nature of the polymer matrix and the nanoreinforcement used. The highest interfacial strength value we have observed in open literature is 500 MPa Wagner et al. [67]. Gou et al. [22] have also simulated the presence of a SWCNT reinforcement in a epoxy matrix and reported 75 MPa as the interfacial strength, 75 % higher than what has been simulated in the present work with no use of inter-linker. The maximum interfacial strength recorded in the present work is 102.32 MPa (obtained by interlinking SLGS fibers with PDA). This value is very close to that of conventional/commercial

carbon fibre composites [14, 19, 26, 39, 73]. It is also worth noticing that in the case of stick-slip damping provided by single wall carbon nanotubes embedded in epoxy matrix, the values of the interfacial shear strength used to fit experimental modal loss factors values varies as low as 0.2 MPa - 2 MPa [78]. In the current work, the interfacial strength computed for the SWCNT-SWCNT type nanocomposites is very close to that computed with MD by Zhang et al. [76] with similar inter-linkers and polyethylene matrix. The maximum difference is found be around 2% (for the inter-linker $((CH_2)_{10}N_2H_4)$). In the cases of both SWCNT/SWCNT and SLGS/SLGS nanocomposites the configuration with the $((CH_2)_{10}N_2H_4)$ inter-linker offers the highest interfacial shear strength efficiency, while the $((CH_2)_3N_2H_4)$ group provides the weakest contribution due to its short length, leading to an overall lower stiffness.




Fig. 6: Evidence of localised auxetic effect between the SWCNT reinforcements provided by the inter-linker effect.

4. Conclusion

The pullout and interfacial strengths in nanocomposites with hybrid inter-linker reinforcements have been predicted using a numerical nonlinear tensile atomistic-FE multiscale model. The model predicts a localised geometric distortion when the nanoreinforcements interact with the matrix because of the presence of an inter-linked (auxetic effect), as also predicted in previ-

Table 4: Interfacial strength reported in open literature and present work. The values of present work are from SWCNT-SWCNT and SLGS-SLGS nano-composites only. The terms PEEK, MWCNT and rGO in the table refers to Polyether ether ketone, multiwalled carbon nano tubes and reduced graphene oxide respectively.

Authors	Filler type	Interfacial strength (MPa)	Inter-linker type	Matrix type	Analysis type
Wagner et al. [67]	MWCNT	500	-	Urethane based	Experimental
Gou et al. [22]	SWCNT	75.00	-	Epoxy	MD
Liao and Li [33]	SWCNT	160.00	-	Polystyrene	MD
Rahman and Haque [42]	SLGS	88.00	-	Epoxy	MD
Lv et al. [37]	FSLGS	70.00	-	Polyethylene	MD
Chowdhury and Okabe [13]	SWCNT	75.00	-	Epoxy	MD
Barber et al. [4]	MWCNT	47.00	-	Polyethylene	Experimental
Sager et al. [48]	MWCNT	86.6	-	T650 carbon-Epoxy	KellyTyson model [29]
Jang et al. [28]	rGO	136.6	-	Polycarbonate	Semi-Empirical
Tsuda et al. [66]	MWCNT	14	-	PEEK	Experimental
Roy et al. [44]	SWCNT	160	-	Polyvinylalcohol	Experimental
Present work	SLGS	49.26	-	Epoxy	Atomistic
Present work	SLGS	62.14	PDA	Epoxy	Atomistic
Present work	SLGS	95.25	$(CH_2)_3N_2H_4$	Epoxy	Atomistic
Present work	SLGS	102.32	$(CH_2)_{10}N_2H_4$	Epoxy	Atomistic
Present work	SWCNT	44.28	-	Epoxy	Atomistic
Present work	SWCNT	58.25	PDA	Epoxy	Atomistic
Present work	SWCNT	88.42	$(CH_2)_3N_2H_4$	Epoxy	Atomistic
Present work	SWCNT	98.13	$(CH_2)_{10}N_2H_4$	Epoxy	Atomistic
Zhang et al. [76]	SWCNT	46.48	-	Polyethylene	MD
Zhang et al. [76]	SWCNT	63.45	PDA	Polyethylene	MD
Zhang et al. [76]	SWCNT	90.26	$(CH_2)_3N_2H_4$	Polyethylene	MD
Zhang et al. [76]	SWCNT	100.85	$(CH_2)_{10}N_2H_4$	Polyethylene	MD

ous works using molecular dynamics simulations. The bridging of the nanoreinforcements with a link molecule enhances the pullout strength by upto 30%. The stiffness and surface area of the inter-linkers play a role in enhancing the mechanical strength of overall nanocomposites, with the $(CH_2)_{10}N_2H_4$ interlinker found to be the most in transferring the load. The composites with SWCNT acting both as primary and secondary reinforcements show a slight enhanced pullout performance (2 % more) than the graphene layer based and hybrid nanoreinforcements. As a secondary filler the SWCNTs also offer 10% extra pullout strength when compared to single layer graphene sheets. The interfacial shear strength between the nanoreinforcements and the matrix computed with the multiscale technique shows a very good agreement with analogous configurations simulated using Molecular Dynamics, and also shows a correlation between the specific carbon nanostructure used and the chemical groups used for the inter-link. The model presented in this paper and the configurations of inter-linked nanocomposites proposed may be used to further the. The novelty of this research lies in the development of a simulation methodology that can predict the behaviour of multiphase nanocomposites at multiple length scales in which the nanofillers are bridged by interlinkers.

Acknowledgements

SA acknowledges the Royal Society for the Wolfson Research Merit Award. FS thanks the support of the FP7-NMP-2010-LA-2010-246067 M-RECT project for the logistics support.

References

- [1] Adhikari, S., Flores, E. S., Scarpa, F., Chowdhury, R., and Friswell, M. I. (2014). A hybrid atomistic approach for the mechanics of dna molecules. *Journal of Nanotechnology in Engineering and Medicine*.
- [2] Andrews, R. and Weisenberger, M. (2004). Carbon nanotube polymer composites. *Current Opinion in Solid State and Materials Science*, 8(1):31–37.
- [3] Araby, S., Saber, N., Ma, X., Kawashima, N., Kang, H., Shen, H., Zhang, L., Xu, J., Majewski, P., and Ma, J. (2015). Implication of multi-walled carbon nanotubes on polymer/graphene composites. *Materials & Design*, 65:690–699.
- [4] Barber, A. H., Cohen, S. R., and Wagner, H. D. (2003). Measurement of carbon nanotube–polymer interfacial strength. *Applied Physics Letters*, 82(23):4140–4142.
- [5] Battezzati, L., Pisani, C., and Ricca, F. (1975). Equilibrium conformation and surface motion of hydrocarbon molecules physisorbed on graphit. *Journal of the Chemical Society, Faraday Transactions 2: Molecular and Chemical Physics*, 71:1629–1639.
- [6] Baykasoglu, C. and Mugan, A. (2012a). Coupled molecular/continuum mechanical modeling of graphene sheets. *Physica E: Low-dimensional Systems and Nanostructures*, 45:151–161.
- [7] Baykasoglu, C. and Mugan, A. (2012b). Nonlinear fracture analysis of single-layer graphene sheets. *Engineering Fracture Mechanics*, 96:241–250.
- [8] Bianchi, M., Scarpa, F., and Smith, C. (2008). Stiffness and energy dissipation in polyurethane auxetic foams. *Journal of Materials Science*, 43(17):5851–5860.
- [9] Chandra, Y., Chowdhury, R., Scarpa, F., and Adhikari, S. (2011). Vibrational characteristics of bilayer graphene sheets. *Thin Solid Films*, 519(18):6026–6032.
- [10] Chandra, Y., Scarpa, F., Chowdhury, R., Adhikari, S., and Sienz, J. (2013). Multiscale hybrid atomistic-fe approach for the nonlinear tensile behaviour of graphene nanocomposites. *Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing*, 46:147–153.

- [11] Chen, W. and Tao, X. (2006). Production and characterization of polymer nanocomposite with aligned single wall carbon nanotubes. *Applied Surface Science*, 252(10):3547–3552.
- [12] Chowdhury, R., Adhikari, S., Scarpa, F., and Friswell, M. (2011). Transverse vibration of single-layer graphene sheets. *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics*, 44(20):205401.
- [13] Chowdhury, S. and Okabe, T. (2007). Computer simulation of carbon nanotube pull-out from polymer by the molecular dynamics method. *Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing*, 38(3):747–754.
- [14] Deng, S., Ye, L., and Mai, Y.-W. (1998). Measurement of interfacial shear strength of carbon fibre/epoxy composites using a single fibre pull-out test. *Advanced Composite Materials*, 7(2):169–182.
- [15] Dimitrakopoulos, C., Lin, Y.-M., Grill, A., Farmer, D. B., Freitag, M., Sun, Y., Han, S.-J., Chen, Z., Jenkins, K. A., Zhu, Y., et al. (2010). Wafer-scale epitaxial graphene growth on the si-face of hexagonal sic (0001) for high frequency transistors. *Journal of Vacuum Science & Technology B*, 28(5):985–992.
- [16] Documentation, A. and Manual, U. (2012). Version 6.10. *Simulia, Dassault Systèmes*.
- [17] Du, J. and Cheng, H.-M. (2012). The fabrication, properties, and uses of graphene/polymer composites. *Macromolecular Chemistry and Physics*, 213(10-11):1060–1077.
- [18] DAloia, A., Marra, F., Tamburrano, A., De Bellis, G., and Sarto, M. (2014). Electromagnetic absorbing properties of graphene–polymer composite shields. *Carbon*, 73:175–184.
- [19] fibre composite data sheet, C. (2014). M55 j ud. *Torray Corp*.
- [20] Georgantzinos, S., Giannopoulos, G., and Anifantis, N. (2009). Investigation of stress–strain behavior of single walled carbon nanotube/rubber composites by a multi-scale finite element method. *Theoretical and Applied Fracture Mechanics*, 52(3):158–164.
- [21] Girifalco, L., Hodak, M., and Lee, R. S. (2000). Carbon nanotubes, buckyballs, ropes, and a universal graphitic potential. *Physical Review B*, 62(19):13104.
- [22] Gou, J., Minaie, B., Wang, B., Liang, Z., and Zhang, C. (2004). Computational and experimental study of interfacial bonding of single-walled nanotube reinforced composites. *Computational Materials Science*, 31(3):225–236.

- [23] Gouda, P. S., Kulkarni, R., Kurbet, S., and Jawali, D. (2013). Effects of multi walled carbon nanotubes and graphene on the mechanical properties of hybrid polymer composites. *Advanced Materials Letters*, 4(4):261–270.
- [24] Gupta, S. and Batra, R. (2010). Elastic properties and frequencies of free vibrations of single-layer graphene sheets. *Journal of Computational and Theoretical Nanoscience*, 7(10):2151–2164.
- [25] Gupta, T. K., Singh, B. P., Mathur, R. B., and Dhakate, S. R. (2014). Multi-walled carbon nanotube–graphene–polyaniline multiphase nanocomposite with superior electromagnetic shielding effectiveness. *Nanoscale*, 6(2):842–851.
- [26] Ho, H. and Drzal, T. (1995). Interfacial shear strength. In *Tenth International Conference on Composite Materials. IV. Characterization and Ceramic Matrix Composites*, pages 203–209.
- [27] Hussain, F., Hojjati, M., Okamoto, M., and Gorga, R. E. (2006). Review article: polymer-matrix nanocomposites, processing, manufacturing, and application: an overview. *Journal of composite materials*, 40(17):1511–1575.
- [28] Jang, H.-K., Kim, H.-I., Dodge, T., Sun, P., Zhu, H., Nam, J.-D., and Suhr, J. (2014). Interfacial shear strength of reduced graphene oxide polymer composites. *Carbon*.
- [29] Kelly, A. and Tyson, a. W. (1965). Tensile properties of fibre-reinforced metals: copper/tungsten and copper/molybdenum. *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids*, 13(6):329–350.
- [30] Li, C. and Chou, T.-W. (2003). A structural mechanics approach for the analysis of carbon nanotubes. *International Journal of Solids and Structures*, 40(10):2487–2499.
- [31] Liang, J., Wang, Y., Huang, Y., Ma, Y., Liu, Z., Cai, J., Zhang, C., Gao, H., and Chen, Y. (2009a). Electromagnetic interference shielding of graphene/epoxy composites. *Carbon*, 47(3):922–925.
- [32] Liang, J., Xu, Y., Huang, Y., Zhang, L., Wang, Y., Ma, Y., Li, F., Guo, T., and Chen, Y. (2009b). Infrared-triggered actuators from graphene-based nanocomposites. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C*, 113(22):9921–9927.

- [33] Liao, K. and Li, S. (2001). Interfacial characteristics of a carbon nanotube–polystyrene composite system. *Applied Physics Letters*, 79(25):4225–4227.
- [34] Lin, Y.-M., Dimitrakopoulos, C., Jenkins, K. A., Farmer, D. B., Chiu, H.-Y., Grill, A., and Avouris, P. (2010). 100-ghz transistors from wafer-scale epitaxial graphene. *Science*, 327(5966):662–662.
- [35] Liu, X., Metcalf, T. H., Robinson, J. T., Houston, B. H., and Scarpa, F. (2012). Shear modulus of monolayer graphene prepared by chemical vapor deposition. *Nano Letters*, 12(2):1013–1017. PMID: 22214257.
- [36] Liu, Y. and Kumar, S. (2014). Polymer/carbon nanotube nano composite fibers a review. *ACS Applied Materials & Interfaces*, 6(9):6069–6087. PMID: 24520802.
- [37] Lv, C., Xue, Q., Xia, D., Ma, M., Xie, J., and Chen, H. (2010). Effect of chemisorption on the interfacial bonding characteristics of graphene- polymer composites. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry C*, 114(14):6588–6594.
- [38] Mohammadpour, E. and Awang, M. (2012). Nonlinear finite-element modeling of graphene and single-and multi-walled carbon nanotubes under axial tension. *Applied Physics A*, 106(3):581–588.
- [39] Nightingale, C. and Day, R. (2002). Flexural and interlaminar shear strength properties of carbon fibre/epoxy composites cured thermally and with microwave radiation. *Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing*, 33(7):1021–1030.
- [40] Novoselov, K. S., Geim, A. K., Morozov, S., Jiang, D., Zhang, Y., Dubonos, S., Grigorieva, I., and Firsov, A. (2004). Electric field effect in atomically thin carbon films. *science*, 306(5696):666–669.
- [41] Pei, Q., Zhang, Y., and Shenoy, V. (2010). A molecular dynamics study of the mechanical properties of hydrogen functionalized graphene. *Carbon*, 48(3):898–904.
- [42] Rahman, R. and Haque, A. (2013). Molecular modeling of crosslinked graphene–epoxy nanocomposites for characterization of elastic constants and interfacial properties. *Composites Part B: Engineering*, 54:353–364.

- [43] Rappé, A. K., Casewit, C. J., Colwell, K., Goddard Iii, W., and Skiff, W. (1992). Uff, a full periodic table force field for molecular mechanics and molecular dynamics simulations. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 114(25):10024–10035.
- [44] Roy, D., Bhattacharyya, S., Rachamim, A., Plati, A., and Saboungi, M.-L. (2010). Measurement of interfacial shear strength in single wall carbon nanotubes reinforced composite using raman spectroscopy. *Journal of Applied Physics*, 107(4):043501.
- [45] Saavedra Flores, E., Adhikari, S., Friswell, M., and Scarpa, F. (2011a). Hyperelastic axial buckling of single wall carbon nanotubes. *Physica E: Low-dimensional Systems and Nanostructures*, 44(2):525–529.
- [46] Saavedra Flores, E., Adhikari, S., Friswell, M., and Scarpa, F. (2011b). Hyperelastic finite element model for single wall carbon nanotubes in tension. *Computational Materials Science*, 50(3):1083–1087.
- [47] Sadeghi, M. and Naghdabadi, R. (2010). Nonlinear vibrational analysis of single-layer graphene sheets. *Nanotechnology*, 21(10):105705.
- [48] Sager, R., Klein, P., Lagoudas, D., Zhang, Q., Liu, J., Dai, L., and Baur, J. (2009). Effect of carbon nanotubes on the interfacial shear strength of t650 carbon fiber in an epoxy matrix. *Composites Science and Technology*, 69(7):898–904.
- [49] Sakhaee-Pour, A. (2009). Elastic buckling of single-layered graphene sheet. *Computational Materials Science*, 45(2):266–270.
- [50] Sakhaee-Pour, A., Ahmadian, M., and Naghdabadi, R. (2008). Vibrational analysis of single-layered graphene sheets. *Nanotechnology*, 19(8):085702.
- [51] Satyanarayana, N., Rajan, K. S., Sinha, S. K., and Shen, L. (2007). Carbon nanotube reinforced polyimide thin-film for high wear durability. *Tribology letters*, 27(2):181–188.
- [52] Scarpa, F. and Adhikari, S. (2008). A mechanical equivalence for poisson’s ratio and thickness of c–c bonds in single wall carbon nanotubes. *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics*, 41(8):085306.
- [53] Scarpa, F., Adhikari, S., and Chowdhury, R. (2010a). The transverse elasticity of bilayer graphene. *Physics Letters A*, 374(19):2053–2057.

- [54] Scarpa, F., Adhikari, S., Gil, A., and Remillat, C. (2010b). The bending of single layer graphene sheets: the lattice versus continuum approach. *Nanotechnology*, 21(12):125702.
- [55] Scarpa, F., Adhikari, S., and Phani, A. S. (2009). Effective elastic mechanical properties of single layer graphene sheets. *Nanotechnology*, 20(6):065709.
- [56] Scarpa, F., Chowdhury, R., and Adhikari, S. (2011). Thickness and in-plane elasticity of graphane. *Physics Letters A*, 375(20):2071 – 2074.
- [57] Shokrieh, M. M. and Rafiee, R. (2010a). On the tensile behavior of an embedded carbon nanotube in polymer matrix with non-bonded interphase region. *Composite Structures*, 92(3):647–652.
- [58] Shokrieh, M. M. and Rafiee, R. (2010b). Prediction of young’s modulus of graphene sheets and carbon nanotubes using nanoscale continuum mechanics approach. *Materials & Design*, 31(2):790–795.
- [59] Shokrieh, M. M. and Rafiee, R. (2010c). Stochastic multi-scale modeling of cnt/polymer composites. *Computational Materials Science*, 50(2):437–446.
- [60] Shokrieh, M. M. and Rafiee, R. (2012). Development of a full range multi-scale model to obtain elastic properties of cnt/polymer composites. *Iranian Polymer Journal*, 21(6):397–402.
- [61] Simkins, V., Alderson, A., Davies, P., and Alderson, K. (2005). Single fibre pullout tests on 513 single fibre pullout tests on auxetic polymeric fibres. *Journal of Materials Science*, 40(16):4355–4364.
- [62] Stankovich, S., Dikin, D. A., Dommett, G. H., Kohlhaas, K. M., Zimney, E. J., Stach, E. A., Piner, R. D., Nguyen, S. T., and Ruoff, R. S. (2006). Graphene-based composite materials. *Nature*, 442(7100):282–286.
- [63] Timoshenko, S., Woinowsky-Krieger, S., and Woinowsky-Krieger, S. (1959). *Theory of plates and shells*, volume 2. McGraw-hill New York.
- [64] Tserpes, K. and Papanikos, P. (2005). Finite element modeling of single-walled carbon nanotubes. *Composites Part B: Engineering*, 36(5):468–477.
- [65] Tserpes, K., Papanikos, P., and Tsirkas, S. (2006). A progressive fracture model for carbon nanotubes. *Composites Part B: Engineering*, 37(7):662–669.

- [66] Tsuda, T., Ogasawara, T., Deng, F., and Takeda, N. (2011). Direct measurements of interfacial shear strength of multi-walled carbon nanotube/peek composite using a nano-pullout method. *Composites Science and Technology*, 71(10):1295–1300.
- [67] Wagner, H., Lourie, O., Feldman, Y., and Tenne, R. (1998). Stress-induced fragmentation of multiwall carbon nanotubes in a polymer matrix. *Applied Physics Letters*, 72(2):188–190.
- [68] Wajid, A. S., Das, S., Irin, F., Ahmed, H., Shelburne, J. L., Parviz, D., Fullerton, R. J., Jankowski, A. F., Hedden, R. C., and Green, M. J. (2012). Polymer-stabilized graphene dispersions at high concentrations in organic solvents for composite production. *Carbon*, 50(2):526–534.
- [69] Wang, T., Chen, G., Wu, C., and Wu, D. (2007). Study on the graphite nanosheets/resin shielding coatings. *Progress in organic coatings*, 59(2):101–105.
- [70] Yarrington, P., Zhang, J., Collier, C., and Bednarczyk, B. A. (2005). Failure analysis of adhesively bonded composite joints. In *46 th AIAA/ASME/ASCE/AHS/ASC Structures, Structural Dynamics & Materials Conference*.
- [71] Yu, M.-F., Files, B. S., Arepalli, S., and Ruoff, R. S. (2000a). Tensile loading of ropes of single wall carbon nanotubes and their mechanical properties. *Physical review letters*, 84(24):5552.
- [72] Yu, M.-F., Lourie, O., Dyer, M. J., Moloni, K., Kelly, T. F., and Ruoff, R. S. (2000b). Strength and breaking mechanism of multiwalled carbon nanotubes under tensile load. *Science*, 287(5453):637–640.
- [73] Yusong, Y., Zhao, Y., Li, Y., Dong, Q., and Chen, D. (2014). Effect of sizing on the interfacial shear strength of carbon fiber/epoxy resin monofilament composite. *Journal of Wuhan University of Technology-Mater. Sci. Ed.*, 29(3):483–487.
- [74] Zhang, H.-B., Zheng, W.-G., Yan, Q., Yang, Y., Wang, J.-W., Lu, Z.-H., Ji, G.-Y., and Yu, Z.-Z. (2010). Electrically conductive polyethylene terephthalate/graphene nanocomposites prepared by melt compounding. *Polymer*, 51(5):1191–1196.
- [75] Zhang, J. and Jiang, D. (2011). Interconnected multi-walled carbon nanotubes reinforced polymer-matrix composites. *Composites Science and Technology*, 71(4):466 – 470.

- [76] Zhang, J., Jiang, D., Scarpa, F., and Peng, H.-X. (2013). Enhancement of pullout energy in a single-walled carbon nanotube-polyethylene composite system via auxetic effect. *Composites Part A: Applied Science and Manufacturing*, 55(0):188 – 194.
- [77] Zhang, Z., Sun, Z., Yao, J., Kosynkin, D. V., and Tour, J. M. (2009). Transforming carbon nanotube devices into nanoribbon devices. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 131(37):13460–13463.
- [78] Zhou, X., Shin, E., Wang, K., and Bakis, C. E. (2004). Interfacial damping characteristics of carbon nanotube-based composites. *Compos. Sci. Technol.*, 64:2425.